

# SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress  
1st Session

Vote No. 533

October 27, 1995, 3:23 p.m.  
Page S-16013 Temp. Record

## BALANCED BUDGET RECONCILIATION/New Medicaid Entitlements

**SUBJECT:** Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act of 1995 . . . S. 1357. Exon motion to waive the Budget Act for the consideration of the Feingold/Moseley-Braun/Feinstein amendment No. 3019.

### ACTION: MOTION REJECTED, 45-54

**SYNOPSIS:** As reported, S. 1357, the Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act of 1995, will result in a balanced budget in seven years, as scored by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO). The bill will also provide a \$245 billion middle-class tax cut, \$141.4 billion of which will be to provide a \$500 per child tax credit.

**The Feingold/Moseley-Braun/Feinstein amendment** would create a new program to provide States with funds for home and community-based long-term care services for people with disabilities (\$800 million would be appropriated for fiscal year (FY) 1997, rising to \$6.5 billion by FY 2002 and to \$11.1 billion by 2004); it would pay for its 7-year cost by eliminating the bill provision to treat long-term care insurance like medical insurance for tax purposes (\$9.89 billion) and by eliminating the bill's individual retirement account (IRA) provisions (\$12.73 billion). The amendment would also require States to provide Medicaid benefits for 12 months to individuals who would otherwise have lost those benefits due to their finding jobs and leaving the welfare rolls.

The amendment was offered after all debate time had expired. However, by unanimous consent, 1 minute of debate was permitted on the amendment. Following debate, Senator Domenici raised the point of the order that the amendment was not germane under the Budget Act. Senator Exon then moved to waive the Budget Act for the consideration of the amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to waive favored the amendment; those opposing the motion to waive opposed the amendment.

**NOTE:** A three-fifths majority (60) vote is required to waive the Budget Act. Following the vote, the point of order was sustained and the amendment thus fell.

**Those favoring** the motion to waive contended:

The Feingold/Moseley-Braun amendment would build upon a successful Wisconsin program to provide long-term care by

(See other side)

YEAS (45)			NAYS (54)			NOT VOTING (0)	
Republicans (4 or 8%)	Democrats (41 or 89%)		Republicans (49 or 92%)	Democrats (5 or 11%)		Republicans (0)	Democrats (0)
Cohen	Akaka	Inouye	Abraham	Hatfield	Baucus		
Jeffords	Biden	Johnston	Ashcroft	Helms	Bryan		
Snowe	Bingaman	Kennedy	Bennett	Hutchison	Graham		
Specter	Boxer	Kerry	Bond	Inhofe	Kerrey		
	Bradley	Kohl	Brown	Kassebaum	Nunn		
	Breaux	Lautenberg	Burns	Kempthorne			
	Bumpers	Leahy	Campbell	Kyl			
	Byrd	Levin	Chafee	Lott			
	Conrad	Lieberman	Coats	Lugar			
	Daschle	Mikulski	Cochran	Mack			
	Dodd	Moseley-Braun	Coverdell	McCain			
	Dorgan	Moynihan	Craig	McConnell			
	Exon	Murray	D'Amato	Murkowski			
	Feingold	Pell	DeWine	Nickles			
	Feinstein	Pryor	Dole	Pressler			
	Ford	Reid	Domenici	Roth			
	Glenn	Robb	Faircloth	Santorum			
	Harkin	Rockefeller	Frist	Shelby			
	Heflin	Sarbanes	Gorton	Simpson			
	Hollings	Simon	Gramm	Smith			
		Wellstone	Grams	Stevens			
			Grassley	Thomas			
			Gregg	Thompson			
			Hatch	Thurmond			
				Warner			

#### EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

#### SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

providing money to every State in the Union so that they could copy Wisconsin's success. The cost of this program would be fully offset in the first 7 years by eliminating the bill's tax breaks for long-term care insurance and IRAs. The amendment would also help people make the transition from welfare to work by requiring States to give such people Medicaid coverage for at least the first 12 months after they left welfare. We think this is a sensible amendment that deserves our support.

**Those opposing** the motion to waive contended:

Instead of providing greatly needed tax incentives that let people keep more of their own money to take care of themselves, our colleagues have asked us to create yet one more huge, brand new program that they want to grow at a lightning rate. They want to start it at \$800 million in FY 1997, but by FY 2002 they want it to be over \$6 billion, and they want it to grow at more than \$2 billion per year thereafter. Somehow, our colleagues do not seem to have grasped the fact that most Senators are trying to shrink the size of the Federal Government, not expand it. We will of course reject this amendment.